UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,888	09/20/2000	Chris Connaughton	2100226-991100	6813

30074 7590 08/19/2004

TAFT, STETTINIUS & HOLLISTER LLP
SUITE 1800
425 WALNUT STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202-3957

EXAMINER	
SAIN, GAUTAM	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/665,888	CONNAUGHTON, CHRIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gautam Sain	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 July 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-21 and 23-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-21 and 23-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1) 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1-1) Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding claims 1-33, set forth non-functional descriptive material but fail to set forth physical structures or materials comprising of hardware or a combination of hardware and software within the technological arts (ie., computer) to produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result.

For example claim 1, 8, and 26, the "method" and claim 12 and 33, the "system" reads on a mental construct/abstract idea or at best a computer program, per se. The language such as "file", "character", "HTML", etc., does not clearly define structural elements and not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium. Claims 1-33 are interpreted as software per se, abstract ideas or mental construct and not tangibly embodied on a computer readable medium or hardware.

The dependent claims are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base independent claims (as cited above).

In additional regard to claims 1, 8, 12, 26, 33, even claims 1, 8, 12, 26, 33 are interpreted using the examiner's suggestion as set forth above, said claims are still directed to non-statutory subject matter. Since claim 1, 8, 12, 26, 33 do not display any results, nor do these claims require any intervention from a user, said claim merely

reflects the manipulation of data within a computer and is therefore directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2-1) Claims 1, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998).

Regarding claims 1, 12, Aiken teaches detecting ... files (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

Aiken teaches "comparing ... right file" (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches "generating ... result file" (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

Aiken teaches "wherein ... in the file" (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

2-2) Claims 2, 4, 6, 13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996).

Regarding claims 2, 13, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches detecting ... files (ie., allocating tags for identification, in order to compare the text string that lies between the tags)(col 7, lines 25-35; col 8, lines 10-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 4, 15, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches delaying ... intact (ie., system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit)(col 13, lines 56-60; col 8, line 50 – col 9, line 5; Fig 11B shows the difference between two documents, maintaining the formatting of the modified groups, fig 3A and 3B comparison).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include system displays the resulting difference on the terminal device and stores the difference data in a secondary memory unit as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 6, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches normalization ... of the file (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, line 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

2-3) Claims 3, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Popp et al (US 6651108, filed Aug 14, 1995).

Regarding claims 3, 14, Aiken does not teach, but Popp teaches "files ... HTML tags" (ie., block of HTML statements, HTML template)(col 2, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Aoyama to include block of HTML statements as taught by Popp, providing the benefit of one-to-one mapping between each HTMO element and object classes ... to manipulate the HTML element within an HTML document (Popp, Abstract).

Regarding claim 16, Aiken teaches "normalizer ... in the files" (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

Regarding claim 17, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches normalization ... of the file (ie., parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison)(col 3, line 62 – col 4, line 2; col 7, lines 20-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Popp to include parsing method with rules that create a node tree, which ignores tag nodes and extracts nodes with characters strings for comparison as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 19, Aiken does not teach, but Aoyama teaches "means for ... comparison" (ie, allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag)(col 7, lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Popp to include allocating the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 20, Aiken does not teach, but Aoyama teaches "character ... left files" (ie., document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing character of the nodes)(col 3, line 63 – col 4, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Popp to include document tree which parses a structured document into nodes, then processes each node by comparing character of the nodes as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 21, Aiken does not teach, but Aoyama teaches "detecting ... preformatting end tag" (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Popp to include identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags as taught

by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

2-4) Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Blumer et al (US 5890171, issued mar 1999)

Regarding claim 7, Aiken does not teach, but Blumer teaches "converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file" (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL)(col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura and Aoyama to include converting relative URL to an absolute URL as taught by Blumer to provide the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

2-5) Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Tavor et al (US 6070149, filed Jul 1998).

Regarding claim 23, Aiken does not teach, but Tavori teaches "... removing header tags ..." (ie., deleting mark-up tags from a list; where the header consists of CGI program and a heading)(col 30, lines 10-15; col 10, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include deleting mark-tags that include CGI headers as taught by Tavor, providing the benefit of translating data received from the user to a language that the system understands for further usage (Tavor, col 10, lines 55-59).

2-6) Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Crosby et al (US 607848, filed Mar 1999).

Regarding claim 24, Aiken does not teach, but Crosby teaches "removing ... files" (ie., distilling can include transforming the PostScript file to a PDF file format)(col 2, lines 55 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include distilling a PostScript file to a PDF format as taught by Crosby providing the benefit of displaying a document with dynamic content for display in a static environment (Crosby, col 2, lines 35-45).

2-7) Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999).

Regarding claim 25, Aiken does not teach, but Arora teaches "removing intradocument links from the files" (ie., remove a link between pages that are part of a web site consisting or several related pages that link back to each other and homepage)(col 1, line 59 – col 2, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken and Tamura to include removing links between pages that are part of a web site that link to one another as taught by Arora, providing the benefit of having a consistent style for all pages of a site (col 2, lines 7-14).

2-8) Claims 8, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996).

Regarding claim 8, Aiken teaches "detecting ... files" (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken teaches "comparing ... right file" (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches "generating ... result file" (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

Aiken teaches "wherein ... in the file" (ie., fig 6, item 618A is compared to item 618B – which are comparisons of text segments in the documents)(col 18, lines 3-18 describes a text segment by text segment comparison).

Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches "wherein ... comparison" (ie., allocate the character strings sandwiched between a start and an end tag)(col 7, lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include allocating the character strings between a start and

an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

Regarding claim 9, Aiken teaches "normaliziation ... left files" (ie., punctuation, white space removed; fig 3 shows processing of each character in item 302)(col 5, lines 52-67).

Regarding claim 10, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Aoyama teaches "detecting ... end tag" (ie., identity tags and ignoring tags and the character strings sandwiched between the ignoring tags)(col 3, lines 50-60; col 7, lines 20-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include allocating the character strings between a start and an end tag as taught by Aoyama, providing the benefit of extracting the difference between structured documents properly taking the logical meaning and structure of the structured documents (Aoyama, Abstract section).

2-9) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Aoyama et al (US 5956726, filed Jun 1996), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998) .

Regarding claim 11, Aiken does not teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

2-10) Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999), further in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Blumer (as cited above).

Regarding claim 18, Aiken does not teach, but Blumer teaches "converting relative URLs into absolute URLs in the file" (ie., a program that converts relative URL to an absolute URL)(col 8, lines 44-48; col 11, lines 40-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura, Aoyama and Popp to include converting relative URL to an absolute URL as taught by Blumer to provide the benefit of an improved system for interpreting hypertext links in a document when including the document within another document (Blumer, Title).

2-11) Claims 26, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Popp (as defined above).

Regarding claims 26, 33, Aiken teaches "detecting ... files" (ie., document A and B arranged right –left)(fig 6, item 606; col 16, lines 50-60).

Aiken teaches "detecting ... characters" (ie., punctuation, white space removed; fig 3 shows processing of each character in item 302)(col 5, lines 52-67).

Aiken does not teach, but Popp teaches "each of which ... HTML document is rendered" (ie., block of HTML statements, HTML template)(col 2, lines 1-5).

Aiken teaches "comparing ... right file" (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2).

Aiken teaches "generating ... group" (ie., fig 6, item 606 screen shot is a result screen that shows document A and B with their format and comparison results in the 602 pane).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include block of HTML statements as taught by Popp, providing the benefit of one-to-one mapping between each HTML element and object classes ... to manipulate the HTML element within an HTML document (Popp, Abstract).

2-12) Claims 27, 28, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998).

Regarding claim 27, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing the groups ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura,

providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

Regarding claim 28, Aiken teaches "line-by-line ... groups" (ie., describes a text-segment by text segment comparison of corresponding text-segments)(col 18, lines 3-18).

Regarding claim 32, Aiken does not expressly teach, but Tamura teaches normalizing ... removing carriage returns ... (ie., removing the carriage returns)(col 4, lines 20-25).

Aiken teaches "comparing ... right file" (ie., fig 6 shows Document A has content segment 2, where document B does not have segment 2). Specifically, a skilled artisan upon normalizing by removing the carriage returns from the documents (as taught by Tamura) would be in a position to compare the two documents.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken and Popp to include removing carriage returns as taught by Tamura, providing the benefit of crating documents with an open document architecture (Tamura, title) and removing a hard carriage return code when editing the document in a processable mode (col 2, lines 32-40).

2-13) Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Tavor et al (US 6070149, filed Jul 1998).

Regarding claim 29, Aiken does not teach, but Tavori teaches "... removing header tags ..." (ie., deleting mark-up tags from a list; where the header consists of CGI program and a heading)(col 30, lines 10-15; col 10, lines 64-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Tamura to include deleting mark-tags that include CGI headers as taught by Tavor, providing the benefit of translating data received from the user to a language that the system understands for further usage (Tavor, col 10, lines 55-59).

2-14) Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Popp (as defined above), further in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Crosby et al (US 607848, filed Mar 1999).

Regarding claim 30, Aiken does not teach, but Crosby teaches "removing ... files" (ie., distilling can include transforming the PostScript file to a PDF file format)(col 2, lines 55 – 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Popp andTamura to include distilling a PostScript file to a PDF format as taught by Crosby providing the benefit of displaying a document with dynamic content for display in a static environment (Crosby, col 2, lines 35-45).

2-15) Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aiken (US 6658626, filed Sep 3, 1999), in view of Popp (as defined above), further

in view of Tamura (US 5717945, issued Feb 1998), further in view of Arora et al (US 5911145, issued Jun 8, 1999).

Regarding claim 31, Aiken does not teach, but Arora teaches "removing intradocument links from the files" (ie., remove a link between pages that are part of a web site consisting or several related pages that link back to each other and homepage)(col 1, line 59 – col 2, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Aiken in view of Popp and Tamura to include removing links between pages that are part of a web site that link to one another as taught by Arora, providing the benefit of having a consistent style for all pages of a site (col 2, lines 7-14).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 703-305-8777. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703)305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G. S

GS

JOSEPH H. FEILD
PRIMARY EXAMINER